



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,153	12/08/2000	Richard Golden	20990023-1	2118

7590 05/19/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SHRADER, LAWRENCE J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/733,153

Applicant(s)

GOLDEN, RICHARD

Examiner

Lawrence Shrader

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the Applicant's amendment filed on 2/19/2004.
2. The Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by the Applicants amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 – 5, 7, 8, 11; 12 – 17; and 18 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Claussen et al., 6,675,354 (hereinafter referred to as Claussen).

In regard to claim 1:

"parsing the input stream,

as a tag is found during the parsing process, building a tree representation of the input stream and the objects bound to tags by building the object mapped to the tag found into the tree representation according to the tag structure,"

Claussen discloses parsing an XML input stream, identifying nesting and building a tree from the tags (column 6, line 8 to column 7, line 34).

"invoking, in response to finding a start tag, the start method defined in the object mapped to the tag found, and

invoking, in response to finding an end tag, the end method defined in the object mapped to the tag found,

wherein, due to the fact that the object is built into the tree representation before one of the methods defined by it is invoked, the method invoked has awareness of the position of the tag to which it is mapped within the tree structure, as the tree structure is built."

Claussen discloses invoking a method (a Java object) at an XML tag (column 3, lines 30 – 42; column 7, lines 5 - 34). The tag tree has an inherent hierarchical nature, and a method invoked by a tag would also inherently have an awareness of the position of the tag to which it is mapped.

In regard to claim 2, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...the extensible markup language is XML."

Claussen discloses an XML based system (column 5, lines 48 – 50).

In regard to claim 3, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...the discrete software components are classes in an object-oriented programming language or procedures or functions in a procedural programming language."

See column 3, line 33.

In regard to claim 4, incorporating the rejection of claim 3:

"...the input stream comprises at least one tag which is formed by a start tag and an end tag,...at least one of a method which is invoked as the start tag is parsed..."

Claussen discloses an XML document that is parsed having start tags and end tags (column 6, lines 38 – 49).

In regard to claim 5, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...when the input stream is parsed, a hierarchical memory structure, which corresponds to the input stream, is also built in a memory of the computer system."

Calussen discloses that a hierarchical (tree) structure is built using the DOM parser
(column 7, lines 20 – 34).

In regard to claim 7, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...an extensible markup language output stream is generated, and the output is used as an input stream for another execution method."

See column 7, lines 5 – 34.

In regard to claim 8, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...the computer system is a server in a network, and the input stream processed by the server is comprised in a request received from a client over the network or is comprised in an output from a database."

See Figure 1.

In regard to claim 11, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"the computer system comprises a local computer and a remote computer which communicate with each other, and at least some of the commands...are executed on the remote computer, but the results of the execution are output on the local computer,,,, wherein the communication between the local and the remote computers comprises an extensible markup language stream..."

See Figure 1.

In regard to claim 12 (a computer system corresponding to the method of claim 1):

Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Art Unit: 2124

In regard to claim 13 (a computer system corresponding to the method of claim 7), incorporating the rejection of claim 12: Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 7.

In regard to claim 14 (a computer system corresponding to the method of claim 8), incorporating the rejection of claim 12: Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 8.

In regard to claim 15 (a computer system corresponding to the method of claim 9), incorporating the rejection of claim 12: Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 9.

In regard to claim 16 (a computer system corresponding to the method of claim 10), incorporating the rejection of claim 12: Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 10.

In regard to claim 17 (a computer system corresponding to the method of claim 11), incorporating the rejection of claim 14: Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 11.

In regard to claim 18 (a computer program product including program code corresponding to the method of claim 1): Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 1 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 19 (a computer program product including program code corresponding to the method of claim 11), incorporating the rejection of claim 18:

"...wherein the program code is stored on a computer-readable medium data carrier or is in the form of signals transmitted over a computer network."

Claussen discloses transmittal of program code as signals transmitted over a network (see Figure 1)

In regard to claim 20 (a computer program product including program code corresponding to the method of claim 1), incorporating the rejection of claim 18:

"a class which parses the input stream,"

"a class which implements a parses interface,"

"a class which creates a document,"

"a class which creates a taglet, i.e. which binds objects to tag names,"

"a class which provides behavior for the taglets."

Classen discloses code that parses the input stream and implements the parser interface, and generates a document (column 5, lines 1 – 23), a class that binds objects to tag names and provides behavior for the tag (column 7, lines 5 – 34).

In regard to claim 21 (a signal transmitted over a computer network): Rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 1 (a corresponding method).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2124

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claussen et al., U.S. Patent 6,675,354 in view of Walker et al., 6,434,529 (hereinafter referred to as Walker).

In regard to claim 6, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...the mapping between the tags and the discrete software objects is changed before, during or after the parsing process."

Calussen discloses mapping tags to software objects, but does not disclose changing the mapping during the parsing process. However, Walker discloses mapping changes between tags and objects (column 12, lines 39 – 44) to change color on a newly registered object. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Claussen invention with the ability to change the mapping process as taught by Walker, because the ability to modify the mapping gives flexibility to the mapping process in cases where different objects may be selected by a user requiring, for example, different coloring in selected objects, as taught by Walker (column 12, lines 45 – 54)

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claussen et al., U.S. Patent 6,675,354 in view of Meltzer et al., 6,125,391 (hereinafter referred to as Meltzer).

In regard to claim 9, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...the invoked software components comprise at least one software component for accessing a database."

Calussen discloses mapping tags to software objects, but does not disclose invoking software components for accessing a database. However, Meltzer discloses XML documents for transferring information over a network having database access (see column 24, lines 48 – 53; Figures 3 and 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Claussen invention with the database access of the Meltzer XML based system because the combination allows the creation of a set of events recognized by JAVA methods as taught by Meltzer at column 24, lines 54 – 59).

In regard to claim 10, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...the invoked software components comprise at least one of a software component for sending electronic mail and a software component for sending facsimiles."

Calussen discloses mapping tags to software objects, but does not disclose invoking software. However, Meltzer discloses XML documents for sending electronic mail and faxes over a network (see column 15, lines 1 – 15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Claussen invention with the XML documents for sending electronic mail and faxes over a network as taught by Meltzer because the combination allows the creation of a set of events recognized by JAVA methods as taught by Meltzer at column 24, lines 54 – 59.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 6,704,736 to Rys et al., regarding transformation of information into a hierarchical XML document for exchange with a database.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Lawrence Shrader
Examiner
Art Unit 2124

10 May 2002



**TODD INGBERG
PRIMARY EXAMINER**